



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.              | CONFIRMATION NO.            |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/675,125   | 09/30/2003  | Dimitris Achlioptas  | MS302222.1/MSFTP477US            | 4957                        |
| 27195 7590 12/10/2008<br>AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP<br>127 Public Square<br>57th Floor, Key Tower<br>CLEVELAND, OH 44114 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B |                             |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2444                 | PAPER NUMBER                |
|  |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE<br>12/10/2008  | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

|                              |                                      |   |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/675,125 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>ACHLIOPTAS, DIMITRIS |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Scott Christensen | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2444                     |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-30 and 32-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-30 and 32-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in regards to the most recent papers filed on 8/18/2008

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claims 1-3, 5-20, 24-30, 32-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. (Graham) US Pat. No. 6582475, in view of Stern (Stern), US PG. Pub. No. 2003/0038840.

3. Regarding **Claim 1**, Graham discloses a system comprising: a processor (**Fig 1, 14**); at least one input component , the input component comprising a plurality of semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer-based

Art Unit: 2444

interaction (**Fig 3, 302 & Col. 4, lines 46-52 & Fig. 8**) a series of concepts of interest (**semantic-centric**) are selected (inputted) by the user via the concept add button **808**, that receives user annotations regarding user perceptions about a current computer-based interaction; (**Col. 6, lines 20-24 & Fig 5**) user **504**, inputs information (annotation) used by the annotation agent **508** regarding the user interest in internet based document **502** and a profile component that populates a profile of the user, on a computer readable storage medium (**Col. 3, lines 52-55**), with the user annotations (**Col. 6, lines 25-28 & Fig. 5**) profile editor **518** is employed to maintain the interests and user specific information in the user profile file **516**. However, Graham does not explicitly teach: automatically.

In the same field of endeavor, Stern teaches, (page 5, ¶0055, lines 9-12 & 23-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Stern's teachings as discussed above with the teachings of Graham, for the purpose of (see Stern, ¶0015). Graham provides motivation to do so, by personalizing operation of an assistant for a particular user by setting of sensitivity level and selection of relevant topics of interest (see Graham, Col. 2, lines 6-9).

4. Regarding **Claim 2**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising a web

Art Unit: 2444

browser **(Col. 9, lines 32-35) in a preferred embodiment, the software forms a part of a stand-alone browser.**

5. Regarding **Claim 3**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising a search engine **(Col. 8, lines 47-54) check box 838 permits the user to select to enable a search engine.**

6. Regarding **Claim 5**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the semantic-centric input components respectively are UI buttons **(Col. 4, lines 46-52 & Fig. 8, 808) concept add button.**

7. Regarding **Claim 6**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising an extraction component that analyzes a web page and that extracts semantic components of at least portions of the web page **(Fig. 5, 512) content recognition extracts the semantic components of a document from internet.**

8. Regarding **Claim 7**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a profile review component **(Fig. 5, 518) profile editor** that allows the user to review and/or edit

the profile (**Col. 6, lines 27-28**) user 504, employs the profile editor 518 to modify the content of the user profile 516.

9. Regarding **Claim 8**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising an inference component that makes declarations on behalf of the user (**Fig. 7, 700 & Col. 7, lines 5-19**) belief system 700 makes the declarations.

10. Regarding **Claim 9**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 8, the inference component comprising at least one of: a support vector machine (SVM), a naive Bayes model, a Bayesian network, a decision tree, a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), neural network, data fusion engine (**Col. 7, line 5**) Bayesian belief network 700.

11. Regarding **Claim 10**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 8, the inference component comprising a classifier (**Fig. 7, 700 & Col. 7, lines 5-19**) system 700 Bayesian belief analyzer (classifier) makes the declarations.

12. Regarding **Claim 11**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 8, the inference component inferring when to make a declaration on behalf of the user (**Col. 7, lines 43-46**) the

Art Unit: 2444

**structure and content of system 700 Bayesian belief analyzer (classifier) are updated without the user input by the stage 624.**

13. Regarding **Claim 12**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a privacy-preserving searching component that allows the user to search for others who have a similar profile as the user **(Col. 7, lines 32-34) a users profiles can be searched for amongst other users profiles and found and then edited and or used.**

14. Regarding **Claim 13**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1, wherein dissemination of at least a portion of the user profile is selective and controlled by the discretion of the user **(Col. 8, lines 1-7 & Fig. 8, 802) the user can select to whom to assign rights of access to its profile by selecting them be it another user or a group of users.**

15. Regarding **Claim 14**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the system of claim 1, the user profile comprising information relating to opinions, expertise, and experiences of the user, the profile being created by the user in a passive manner **(Col. 6, lines 25-29) the concepts of interest and other user specific information are maintained in a user profile by the user.**

Art Unit: 2444

16. Regarding **Claim 15**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the computer-based interaction is viewing any one of a web page, a web site, and search results (**Col. 6, 31-36**) **the interaction is with the internet which includes a web page or a web site.**

17. **Claim 16** lists all the same elements of claim 1, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 16.

18. **Claim 17** lists all the same elements of claim 1, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 17.

19. **Claim 18** lists all the same elements of claim 5, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 5 applies equally as well to claim 18.

20. **Claim 19** lists all the same elements of claim 4, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 4 applies equally as well to claim 19.



Art Unit: 2444

21. **Claim 20** lists all the same elements of claim 6, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 20.

22. **Claim 24** lists all the same elements of claim 6, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 24.

23. **Claim 25** lists all the same elements of claim 7, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 25.

24. **Claim 26** lists all the same elements of claim 7, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 26.

25. **Claim 27** lists all the same elements of claim 8, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 8 applies equally as well to claim 27.

26. Regarding **Claim 28**, Graham discloses a method comprising: browsing information stored on an electronic medium (**Col. 6, 31-36**) **browsing the internet**

**where the information is stored on an electronic medium; selectively making at least one declaration about at least a portion of the information being browsed (Fig 3, 302 & Col. 4, lines 46-52 & Fig. 8) a series of concepts of interest (semantic-centric) are selected (inputted) by the user via the concept add button 808 based at least in part on a plurality of semantic-centric input components that reflect context of at least a portion of the stored information (Fig 3, 302 & Col. 4, lines 46-52 & Fig. 8) a series of concepts of interest (semantic-centric) are selected (inputted) by the user via the concept add button 808 which is reflective of the context of the stored information; annotating a user's personal profile with the at least one declaration (Col. 6, lines 20-24 & Fig 5) user 504, inputs information (annotation) used by the annotation agent 508 regarding the user interest in internet based document 502 (Col. 6, lines 25-28 & Fig. 5) profile editor 518 is employed to maintain the interests and user specific information in the user profile file 516; and selectively sharing the user's personal profile with the others (Col. 8, lines 1-7 & Fig. 8, 802) the user can select to whom to assign rights of access to its profile by selecting them be it another user or a group of users. However, Graham does not explicitly teach: automatically.**

In the same field of endeavor, Stern teaches, (page 5, ¶0055, lines 9-12 & 23-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Stern's teachings as discussed above with the teachings of Graham, for the purpose of (see Stern, ¶0015). Graham

Art Unit: 2444

provides motivation to do so, by personalizing operation of an assistant for a particular user by setting of sensitivity level and selection of relevant topics of interest (see Graham, Col. 2, lines 6-9).

27. Regarding **Claim 29**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the user is browsing a web page and concurrently makes declarations regarding the user's perceptions with respect to the web page **(Fig. 8 & Fig. 9) depicts the browsing and declaration.**

28. Regarding **Claim 30**, Graham-Stern disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Graham further discloses the method of claim 28 performed at least in part by a web browser **(Fig. 8 & Fig. 9) depicts the web browser performing the task.**

29. **Claim 32** lists all the same elements of claim 1, but in computer-readable storage medium form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 32.

30. Regarding **Claim 33**, Graham discloses a system comprising: a means for providing one or more input components, the input component comprising a plurality of semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer-based interaction **(Fig 3, 302 & Col. 4, lines 46-52 & Fig. 8) a series of concepts of interest (semantic-centric) are selected (inputted) by the user via the concept add button**

Art Unit: 2444

**808**, that receive at least one user annotation regarding a user's perceptions about a current computer-based interaction (**Col. 6, lines 20-24 & Fig 5**) **user 504, inputs information (annotation) used by the annotation agent 508 regarding the user interest in internet based document 502**; and a means for annotating a user profile, in a computer readable storage medium (**Col. 3, lines 52-55**), with the user's perceptions (**Col.6, lines 25-28 & Fig. 5**) **profile editor 518 is employed to maintain the interests and user specific information in the user profile file 516**. However, Graham does not explicitly teach: automatically.

In the same field of endeavor, Stern teaches, (page 5, ¶0055, lines 9-12 & 23-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Stern's teachings as discussed above with the teachings of Graham, for the purpose of (see Stern, ¶0015). Graham provides motivation to do so, by personalizing operation of an assistant for a particular user by setting of sensitivity level and selection of relevant topics of interest (see Graham, Col. 2, lines 6-9).

31. Regarding **Claim 34**, Graham further discloses the system of claim 33, further comprising: means for analyzing a web page (**Fig 5, 508**); means for extracting one or more semantic components of at least a portion of the web page (**Fig 5, 508**); and means for morphing the one or more input components based at least in part upon the semantic components in an automatic fashion (**Fig. 8**).

32. **Claim 35**, lists all the same elements of claim 28, but in means for form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 28 applies equally as well to claim 35.

33. Regarding **Claim 36**, Graham discloses a system comprising: a processor (**Fig 1, 14**); at least one input component, the input component comprising a plurality of semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer-based interaction (**Fig 3, 302 & Col. 4, lines 46-52 & Fig. 8**) **a series of concepts of interest (semantic-centric) are selected (inputted) by the user via the concept add button 808**, that receives user annotations regarding user perceptions about a current computer-based interaction; (**Col. 6, lines 20-24 & Fig 5**) **user 504, inputs information (annotation) used by the annotation agent 508 regarding the user interest in internet based document 502** wherein the user perceptions at least in part relate to at least one of an emotional response of the user, an experience of the user, a desire of the user, a philosophy of the user, a preference of the user, a goal of the user, an opinion of the user, relevance to the user, a theology of the user, an insight of the user, and a conception of the user (**what the user sees on the screen is what the user perceives and what is displayed on the screen is in part related to the users goal of selection of a portion of the document to be printed**); and a profile component that populates a profile of the user, on a computer readable storage medium (**Col. 3, lines 52-55**), with the user annotations (**Col. 6, lines 25-28 & Fig. 5**) **profile**

Art Unit: 2444

**editor 518 is employed to maintain the interests and user specific information in the user profile file 516.** However, Graham does not explicitly teach: automatically.

In the same field of endeavor, Stern teaches, (page 5, ¶0055, lines 9-12 & 23-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Stern's teachings as discussed above with the teachings of Graham, for the purpose of (see Stern, ¶0015). Graham provides motivation to do so, by personalizing operation of an assistant for a particular user by setting of sensitivity level and selection of relevant topics of interest (see Graham, Col. 2, lines 6-9).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

34. **Claims 21- 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, in view of Stern, further in view of Wolpe (US PG Pub. No. 2002/0174144) hereafter "Wolpe".

35. Regarding **Claim 21**, Graham-Stern substantially discloses the method of Claim 20. However Graham does not explicitly teach morphing the one or more input components.

In the same field of endeavor, Wolpe teaches (**Page 3, ¶ 0034, lines 18-25**) changing or morphing of a word or phrase, which may be a personalized (semantic) version of a word or phrase presented to the user in a popup window.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Wolpe's teaching of changing or morphing of the input component with the teachings of Graham-Stern, for the purpose of **(see Wolpe, Page 1, ¶0008, lines 12-17)** enabling users to seamlessly manage, navigate, and share the information both locally and remotely via a LAN, WAN or the Internet. Graham provides motivation to do so, by personalizing the operations of an assistant for a particular user by setting sensitivity levels and selection of relevant information and topics of interest **(see Graham, Page 2, lines 6-12)**.

36. Regarding **Claim 22**, Graham-Stern-Wolpe substantially discloses the method of Claim 21. However Graham does not explicitly teach the morphing of the one or more input components based at least in part upon user behavior with respect to movement of a pointer device.

In the same field of endeavor, Wolpe teaches **(Page 4, ¶ 0038, lines 1-9)** monitoring the user's behavior base on the user's manipulation of the mouse or other user interface devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine Wolpe's teaching of monitoring the user's behavior base on the users manipulation of the mouse or other user interface devices with the teachings of Graham-Stern, for the purpose of **(see Wolpe, Page 1, ¶0008, lines 12-17)** enabling users to seamlessly manage, navigate, and share the information both locally and remotely via a LAN, WAN or the Internet. Graham provides

Art Unit: 2444

motivation to do so, by personalizing the operations of an assistant for a particular user by setting sensitivity levels and selection of relevant information and topics of interest (see **Graham, Page 2, lines 6-12**).

37. Regarding **Claim 23**, Graham-Stern-Wolpe substantially discloses the method of Claim 22. Graham further discloses the pointer device comprising a mouse (**Fig. 1, 36 & Col. 4, lines 22-25**) **user 504 using a mouse 36**.

### ***Response to Arguments***

38. Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

39. On pages 8-12, Applicant argues the rejection of the instant claims under Graham in view of Stern under 35 USC 103. Applicant's sole argument appears to focus on the claim limitation "that automatically reflect context of the current computer-based interaction..."

On page 9, Applicant provides an example of what Applicant intends for this claim limitation to entail. Specifically, the system appears to determine the contents of the web page, then provide a button based on the specific determined contents of the web page in a specific form. However, the instant claims do not require this level of detail. The instant claim provides no elaboration on what how the inputs reflect the context, how the inputs automatically reflect the context, or any other specific details.



Further, the term "automatically" provides no level of detail on how the functionality is performed. If at least one step in the process is performed by the system as opposed to the user, the process can be said to be performed "automatically."

Further, the instant claim only requires that the input components "automatically reflect" the context. There is no requirement that any functionality is performed, as this appears to be a property of the input components, as opposed to a functionality that the system is performing. If an input component has the property of reflecting the context of the interaction, it can be said that the component automatically reflects the context of the interaction. Accordingly, without any detail as to how the functionality is performed automatically, or even that a functionality is performed automatically, the teachings of Graham as modified Stern teaches this claim limitation in as much detail as required by the instant claim. Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly reflect what functionality is being performed automatically by the system, and how the functionality is performed automatically.

Further, the instant claim provides no details as to what constitutes reflecting the context of the current computer-based interaction. A button that simply states "print" that provides the command to print a currently opened document when the button is actuated reflects the context of the current computer-based interaction, as the button is a command for the current document. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, Applicant

Art Unit: 2444

should amend the instant claim to clearly demonstrate what constitutes an "interaction," the "context" of the interaction, and what is required to "reflect" the context.

40. On pages 12-13, Applicant argues the rejection of claims 21-23. However, the presented arguments rely on the infallibility of the argument presented on pages 8-12, addressed above, and are thus deemed insufficient for at least the reasons addressed above.

***Conclusion***

41. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Christensen whose telephone number is (571)270-1144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2444

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444